

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/619,897 | Applicant(s) TAKAGI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner James M Hewitt | Art Unit 3679 | |

All Participants:

(1) James M Hewitt.

(2) Joe Jochman.

Date of Interview: 28 October 2005

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

double patenting rejection based on U.S. Patent No. 6,866,302

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

On 3/17/05, Applicant's representative agreed to the abstract being rewritten as reflected in the accompanying Examiner's Amendment since the abstract submitted in Applicant's 2/16/05 amendment did not comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.72, and also agreed to a minor spelling change in the specification and to delete extraneous numeral "15" in line 12 of claim 1.

On 10/28/05, the examiner informed Applicant's representative that a terminal disclaimer would have to be filed to obviate an obviousness-type double patenting rejection based on U.S. Patent No. 6,866,302.